

CREATING A FRONT DOOR TO ARCHIVAL KNOWLEDGE IN THE UNITED STATES: GUIDELINES FOR A MASTER OF ARCHIVAL STUDIES DEGREE

TYLER O. WALTERS

ABSTRACT: The author explores the need for the Master of Archival Studies (M.A.S.) degree in the United States and its expression through the Society of American Archivists' *Guidelines for the Development of a Curriculum for a Master of Archival Studies*. He contends that the substantial and distinct body of archival knowledge, coupled with the emergence of new information technologies that have changed the way archives are created, maintained, and used, make an autonomous two-year degree curriculum necessary. The article examines SAA's history in educational guidelines development, the Canadian experience with educational guidelines and twelve years of M.A.S. degree programs, the growth of U.S. graduate archival education during the 1980s, and major features of the 1993 draft M.A.S. guidelines.

Suppose you are a student about to graduate with a bachelor's degree today. Your degree may be in history, political science, sociology, English, or any other subject for that matter. While fulfilling the graduation requirements, you completed an extended paper based upon researching primary documents. Perhaps you are a student who recently completed a master's degree in history with a thesis, or a master's of library science with an internship in the local university archives or manuscript repository. More than likely, you and other students fitting these descriptions had contact with archivists. Facing an imminent career decision, you reflect on your experience with historical documents and proceed to learn more about the field of archives. You eventually decide to pursue archives as a career.

Where should students like these go to receive an education in the field of archives? If they hold a history master's degree, perhaps they should get a library science degree. If they hold an M.L.S., perhaps they should get a master's in history. What if they recently finished undergraduate degrees and want to pursue an archives career? Most likely they will need to pursue another

degree in history or library science—but which one? Why are students pursuing advanced degrees in history and library science? Are they not looking for an education to become archivists? Yes, but today most archival curricula are a minor portion of a history graduate degree or a master of library science program.

In the United States students must pursue degrees in other fields, typically history or library science, if they want to become archivists. This could be thought of as the “back door” approach to entry into the archives profession. If the back door to archives is studying history or library science, then the front door must be studying archives. However, the situation is frustrating because, after consulting the 1993/94 SAA Education Directory, students discover that no education programs in the United States provide a major field in archives. In fact, programs offering a minor concentration tend to package the study of all archival methods into one course coupled with a semester-long practicum and course offerings introducing tangential areas like oral history and documentary editing. This approach places a heavy emphasis on learning through practical experience, which is no different than the on the job learning methods that generations of U.S. archivists have experienced. What is an aspiring archivist to do?

Today, many archivists want to build that front door to the profession for their future colleagues. They wish to impart to these students the wealth of knowledge and experience they have accumulated about archives as well as create a place to study documentary issues and improve archival methods. The students as future archival practitioners desire comprehensive education regarding the nature of archives, the existence of certain ideas and methodologies, and the use of certain practices. But today these students cannot find the front door to archival knowledge—because it does not exist. Equally important is the fact that without a larger body of research, archivists will continue to experience difficulties in developing methods to manage records in modern society. These desires of archivists, and students aspiring to become archivists, can be mutually satisfied through Master of Archival Studies (M.A.S.) degree programs.

The U.S. archival profession needs Master of Archival Studies degree programs because a substantial body of knowledge exists that is best communicated to students through a university-based curricular program. Studying archives through university curricula is nothing new in the United States; archives courses have been available in universities for many years. However, the vast amount of unique knowledge archivists must master about records throughout their life cycle, as well as the considerable knowledge coming from other disciplines that enhance archival methods and practice, suggest that a two-year degree program where archives is the major field of study is long overdue. But the need for M.A.S. programs is driven by more than just the sheer amount of knowledge to be learned. Because the archives discipline is distinct from other disciplines, such as history or library science, it needs a distinct degree. In support of this assertion Terry Eastwood has written that “the knowledge which archivists need to do their job and on which their techniques are based must be distinctive because the nature of archives, a centuries-old form of documentation, is distinctive, and therefore archival education must be distinctive.”¹ The archival profession’s distinct and substantial body of knowledge requires, at a minimum,

a two-year graduate degree to prepare archivists for all the challenges they will face throughout their careers.

Another major reason for the existence of M.A.S. degrees is that, in light of the rapidly changing environment in which records are created, maintained, and disseminated, archival education can no longer consist of a few introductory archives courses. This changing environment is largely represented by the new information technologies and systems in place. Archivists must continue to develop better methods of identifying, selecting, appraising, and confirming the authentic nature of modern records in this changing environment. Graduate archival education must provide a pedagogical forum where interdisciplinary perspectives and methods can be brought to bear upon the crucible of core archival knowledge. For all these reasons it is important to develop degree programs in which archives is the major field of study, not just the minor concentration.

Given the lack of opportunity for students to concentrate their graduate studies on archives, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) has decided to create guidelines for establishing Master of Archival Studies degree programs. In May, 1993 the SAA Committee on Education and Professional Development (CEPD) released its draft "Guidelines for the Development of a Curriculum for a Master of Archival Studies." The 1993 draft guidelines revise the 1988 SAA graduate archival education guidelines because graduate archival education programs have not been developing to the point where they are addressing all the curriculum elements described in the 1988 document. In 1990 the SAA CEPD realized that an M.A.S. degree program is necessary to incorporate all the knowledge archivists must call upon during their careers. While several archival education programs were developed beyond the three-course sequence called for as the minimum requirement in 1988, they were not creating courses in the core areas of archival practice such as appraisal.

The Society of American Archivists wants future students choosing the archival profession to have the best educational opportunities available in preparing to meet tomorrow's challenges to the archival endeavor. SAA chose to develop M.A.S. guidelines to assist universities that one day may decide to put their resources behind establishing M.A.S. programs. SAA itself is not a university; therefore, it cannot promulgate degree programs. However, SAA can advise universities once the commitment has been made to support the degree. Through the creation of degree program guidelines SAA, as the preeminent archival professional organization in the United States, can be an active advisor to universities and represent the interests of the U.S. archival profession. Professionally sanctioned guidelines for the development of Master of Archival Studies degrees are the appropriate tools to encourage and support universities in the development of degrees in archival studies.

U.S. and Canadian Antecedents

To understand how SAA arrived at creating guidelines for M.A.S. programs one must first look at the history of SAA graduate archival education guidelines. A view of the Canadian experience will also be useful. The Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA) began working on their first education guidelines in tandem with the SAA. The Canadian guidelines of 1976 and the U.S. version of

1977 both began with a common purpose, but one significant difference is evident in the final versions. This difference foreshadowed the course that graduate archival education took in the two countries.

In examining the American progress toward improving graduate archival education, observations on the twelve-year Canadian experience with multiple M.A.S. programs may provide further insights into the M.A.S. degree's likely future in the United States. Understanding the Canadian M.A.S. experience in conjunction with the subsequent growth of U.S. archival education during the 1980s will set the stage for understanding the goals and objectives of SAA in composing M.A.S. guidelines in 1993. These goals and objectives, and the major features of the M.A.S. guidelines, will be examined and shown to be a departure from past SAA guidelines. Finally, additional issues and concerns about the establishment of M.A.S. programs in the United States will be addressed.

1. 1977 SAA Education Guidelines

The history of graduate archival education in the United States is one of dependence. In 1977 the best archival education programs in the U.S. amounted to only a couple courses attached to the educational programs of other disciplines. SAA's 1977 "Guidelines for a Minor or Concentration in Archival Education" stand as a monument to this vision of U.S. archival education. The purpose of the 1977 version of the SAA Committee on Education and Professional Development (SAA CEPD), and the guidelines they were to produce, was "to consider the recommendations on education made by the SAA Committee for the 1970s."² The Committee for the 1970s' conclusions were that archives "does not constitute a sufficient intellectual discipline to merit a separate degree program," and that "our best interests as a profession are not served by attempts to develop separate degree programs in our universities and colleges for archives administration."³

The 1977 guidelines codified what had been occurring already within the better sequences of archival education courses found in U.S. universities. A three-course minor concentration in archives built onto history or library science programs was the model advocated in this document. This minor would cover the subject matter defined as "the nature of archives," "the acquisition of archives," "the processing of archives," "the use of archives," and "the administration of archives." These subject areas, comprising the same basic professional concerns shared by archivists today, were somehow to be covered comprehensively in SAA's recommended minor concentration. The text of the 1977 guidelines reflected this perspective.⁴

The SAA guidelines bear a strong resemblance to the Association of Canadian Archivists' "Guidelines Towards A Curriculum for Graduate Archival Training Leading to A Master's Degree in Archival Science," developed by Edwin Welch and Hugh Taylor in 1976. Canadian archivists began discussing formulations for their graduate archival education programs about 1969. Seven years later the need for guidelines for graduate archival education became one of the priorities of the newly formed Association of Canadian Archivists. At the outset the SAA and ACA documents were so similar that even the aforementioned titles of the archival subject areas remained identical. The similarities were personified by the presence of Canadian archivist Hugh Taylor on both

committees responsible for fashioning education guidelines: the ACA Education Committee and the SAA CEPD.

However, one distinct difference exists between the Canadian and U.S. versions. The SAA guidelines refer to being part of a graduate degree and to being a minor concentration. The SAA guidelines specifically ruled out the possibility of establishing an autonomous archival education program, invoking the wisdom of the Committee for the 1970s. The ACA document does not impose the same proscription, instead leaving the door open for the development of graduate degree programs in archival studies. This distinction has been identified by Terry Eastwood who stated, "The ACA's guidelines were constructed so as not to restrict initiatives to establish a separate program of studies leading to a master's degree in a Canadian university." The key words in the title of the SAA guidelines, "minor or concentration," as opposed to the ACA guidelines' "leading to a master's degree," tell the whole story.

By 1977 initiatives in North American archival education had reached a fork in the road; the distinction between the U.S. and Canadian varieties was now stated explicitly. The SAA endorsed programs offering an archives minor grafted onto a master's degree in history or library science. The ACA chose the road toward establishing an autonomous Master of Archival Studies degree. Five years later the first Canadian M.A.S. program was established at the University of British Columbia School of Librarianship, with its first class graduating in 1983.

2. 1988 SAA Education Guidelines

The revision of the 1977 SAA guidelines, approved by SAA Council in February of 1988, develops and articulates several points necessary to improving graduate archival education. Perhaps the most important assertion is that "the work of an archivist represents that of a profession, not a craft or applied vocation. Theory is not only just as important as practice but guides and determines that practice." The relationship between archival theory and practice was not addressed in the 1977 guidelines. However, implicit in those earlier guidelines was an emphasis on practice, not on theory. This is demonstrated in the guidelines' dearth of requisite courses and their preoccupation with practicum administration. Thus, the statement in the 1988 guidelines represents a clear departure from the past.

The 1988 guidelines next address how "the changing nature of the profession demonstrates the need for a more extensive approach to archival education." These guidelines are offered "to support multi-course programs at master's and doctoral levels in related fields or fully independent graduate programs in archival education." For the first time an SAA document referring to standards for graduate archival education in the United States suggests and approves of the existence of stand alone programs. The revised guidelines further state that the "development of graduate archival education programs with additional offerings (more than three courses) will further strengthen the profession and its individual members."⁵ Again, this represents a change in direction from the SAA Committee for the 1970s.

The carefully chosen words in the 1988 guidelines strain to lend support to the establishment of two-year master's degree programs in archival studies. However, they stop short of stating that because the archives discipline is dis-

ting, it therefore needs a distinct degree, as Terry Eastwood declared during that same year.⁶ In fact, the main thrust of these guidelines is to provide a standard for the three-course sequence archival education program.⁷ A member of the SAA CEPD subcommittee responsible for the 1988 guidelines recently wrote that it was "a compromise document that dealt with the complex political realities within the United States, but attempted to set the stage for a full master's program."⁸

The 1988 guidelines also contribute significantly to articulating a comprehensive knowledge base necessary for all archivists. The "curriculum elements" section comprises categories entitled, "Nature of Information, Records, and Historical Documentation," "Archives in Modern Society," "Basic Archival Functions," "Issues and Relationships that Affect Archival Functions," and "Managerial Functions." Along with the many component parts of these categories, this section describes in greater detail than ever before the knowledge base thought to be necessary for archivists.⁹ The vast amount of knowledge essential to understanding archives that is described there makes it impossible to successfully treat the entire body of archival knowledge within three courses. This is just another feature of the 1988 guidelines demonstrating that the U.S. archival profession was ready to probe the possibilities of a full two-year archival studies degree. The now traditional triumvirate of one course in theory, one practicum, and one independent study that was put forth as the model U.S. archival education program in 1977 was again invoked in 1988, but this time it was recognized to be the minimum requirement."¹⁰

3. The Growth of U.S. Graduate Archival Education in the 1980s

Five years after the 1988 guidelines were issued archivists in the United States are less concerned with where to attach archival curricula. Instead, they are focusing on the needs of the archives profession and on developing their own professional education. The most recent example of this perspective is the Winter 1993 issue of the *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, entitled "Educating American Archivists for the Twenty-First Century," and guest edited by Richard Cox. These articles on graduate archival education and continuing education cover topics such as refocusing graduate curricula on core archival knowledge, integrating into curricula the impact of information technology on archival theory, the mission of schools of library and information science to provide archival education, the effectiveness of continuing education in modifying actual archival practice, and developing archival curricula that integrate all aspects of theory, methodology, and practice. This journal issue repeatedly points to two important themes: that archives is a discipline, governed by theory, which informs practice, and that graduate level archival studies degree programs are warranted in the United States to prepare archivists for professional practice based on the knowledge inherent in their discipline.

As the recent archival literature from the United States illustrates, the profession's attention is now centered on the feasibility of establishing and maintaining a two-year graduate level curriculum in archival studies.¹¹ This may not be the leap of faith that some people believe it to be. In fact several graduate programs already go well beyond the SAA's 1988 guidelines. Before describing how far U.S. archival education has come since 1977, it is important to review

the findings of a recent article on U.S. archival education that characterizes its progress as dubious at best.

In the United States, graduate archival education offerings continue to grow in the wake of SAA's 1988 "Guidelines for Graduate Archival Education." Although course offerings have grown, Tim Ericson, in his recently published article, "Abolish the Recent: The Progress of Archival Education," clearly demonstrates that too many of these courses are what he calls "related course work." He regards these as "nice to have and doubtless useful to some extent but too watered down, such as Archives and Museum Administration, or too generic, such as Computer Applications and Their Implications, or tangential to archival work, such as Oral History."¹² This category of course work does little if anything to deliver graduate education in such core archival knowledge areas as appraisal, arrangement and description, and reference.¹³ Ericson also refers to another class of course work he calls "plausible electives." He describes these as "classes such as Seminar in Handling Photographic Collections." These are in fact useful to archivists in many settings. However, they do not form a part of the common ground of theory, methodology, and practice in which all archivists find themselves situated.¹⁴ These categories of course work should not be construed as a substitute for course work in the core archival knowledge areas.

If we are willing to accept the weight of Ericson's criticisms, reason still exists for optimism. In the 1993/94 SAA Education Directory at least eleven out of the thirty-nine programs listed offer three courses addressing the core archival knowledge areas¹⁵ in addition to other courses in the plausible electives area. Incredibly, two schools offer in their catalogs at least twelve archives-related courses listed in the SAA Education Directory. The fact that so many programs developed beyond the existing SAA guidelines is reason enough for updating the guidelines. As was the case with the subsequent growth of archival education after 1977 and 1988, a 1993 update should assist these eleven programs in developing further. However, the observations of Tim Ericson should be heeded. Even within these eleven programs the majority of available courses are outside of the core archival knowledge areas, falling into his categories of "plausible electives" and "related course work." More semester-long courses devoted to exploring the theory, methodology, and practice of core archival topics still need to be developed.

Although curricular development is progressing in a haphazard fashion, a more significant development is occurring in U.S. graduate archival education. The other component critical to any education program is its faculty. The first full-time, tenure-track archival educator was appointed in a U.S. university in 1976, the second in 1982. Ten years after the second appointment approximately nine tenure-track archival educator positions existed. The growth of a faculty of archival educators in the United States during the 1980s, at the rate of one each one and one-half years, represents the most important step to this date in improving U.S. graduate archival education.¹⁶

The growth of a U.S. faculty in archival studies is significant because archival educators are the interested individuals who have the wherewithal to think about developing course instruction and an entire curriculum. They have the resources to devote to investigating archival issues, and for preparing incipient archivists to enter the profession. They will make the case for expanded graduate archival education within their universities.¹⁷ Ultimately, it will be

archival educators who will represent the greater profession in building a commitment in universities to support M.A.S. programs, not practicing archivists and not SAA. These latter two groups do not have the necessary influence. Only the universities themselves can and will decide if they wish to put their resources behind establishing M.A.S. degree programs. With the growth in the number of faculty-level, full-time archival educators, and with more course offerings in core archival functions, U.S. archival education now has the foundation necessary to move toward the establishment of formal Master of Archival Studies programs.

4. Canadian Experience with Education Guidelines and M.A.S. Programs

Another important reason for promulgating the United States M.A.S. guidelines is the success of M.A.S. programs in Canada. When Canadian archivists created guidelines for their Master of Archival Studies degree programs their process of communicating archival knowledge matured, resulting in a much more comprehensive educational method than previously experienced. The Canadians' twelve years of experience with M.A.S. degree programs provide a body of experiences—a testing ground of sorts—for the U.S. archival profession. U.S. archivists can observe, study, and derive principles from the Canadian experience and apply the fruits of this analysis to their own archival education system.

Today four M.A.S. programs exist in Canada: the University of British Columbia, founded in 1981; the Université de Montreal, 1983; the Université Laval, 1988; and the University of Manitoba, 1991. A fifth graduate archival studies program is being established at the University of Toronto Faculty of Library and Information Studies. Additionally, both of the Quebec programs offer undergraduate certificates in archives and records management. Montreal has offered this option since 1983. In a recent essay, Bryan Corbett, the immediate past chair of the Association of Canadian Archivists' Education Committee, identified four important factors in the maturing of the archives profession: the recognition of archives as a separate field of study; the linking together of archives, records management, and manuscript curatorship; the emphasis on the universal and international applicability of archival theory and practice; and the need for research in archival science.¹⁸ It is the recognition of these principles upon which the five Canadian archival studies programs have been founded.

The Canadian programs are continuing to grow and a national standard for graduate archival education is emerging. The University of British Columbia (UBC) School of Librarianship has become the School of Library, Archival and Information Studies. The UBC M.A.S. program now employs three professors of archival studies, having added to its faculty in 1987 and 1991. A fourth faculty member has been appointed recently and will begin in the fall of 1994. The Association of Canadian Archivists' revised M.A.S. guidelines of 1989, entitled "Guidelines for the Development of a Two-Year Curriculum for A Master of Archival Studies Programme," has directly affected the beneficial development of Canadian M.A.S. programs. The new guidelines codify what is defined as archival knowledge and how it is to be delivered in a graduate setting. They address new areas such as the program's location within the university, admis-

sions requirements, and resources for teaching. Where the 1976 Canadian guidelines expressed the hope that one day M.A.S. programs would become a reality, the 1989 Canadian M.A.S. guidelines stand as a testament to the success of the M.A.S.

The results of these new guidelines have been astounding. They were developed concurrently with the reorganization of the UBC program's curricular offerings.¹⁹ The University of Manitoba established its M.A.S. program using these new guidelines. The University of Windsor's History Department has been working closely with the ACA M.A.S. guidelines toward improving their archival studies program. Other institutions of higher education, such as the University of Western Ontario, York University, the University of Ottawa, and Carleton University have all expressed to the ACA interest in supporting graduate archival studies programs. Today, Canadian archivists are developing comprehensive continuing education programs for practicing archivists. Their professional associations are creating the regional elements of a national strategy to encourage the availability of graduate education in all regions of the country. All of these developments stem from a foundation built on twelve years of experience with M.A.S. programs and more than three decades of commitment to making them a reality.²⁰

Features of the 1993 SAA M.A.S. Guidelines: Departures from the Past

With all of the developments in North American archival education, the Society of American Archivists Committee on Education and Professional Development feels that developing M.A.S. programs in the United States is in the archives profession's best interest. In composing the M.A.S. guidelines, the SAA seeks to aid the evolution of graduate archival education by identifying the knowledge areas underlying the field in the United States, developing guidelines to deliver appropriate course work covering those areas, suggesting a configuration of resources necessary to support such a curriculum, and assisting the maturing programs through their developmental stages.²¹ In several areas the M.A.S. guidelines move forward and tackle age-old issues, making them quite different from earlier educational guidelines. Examining some of the critical concepts present in the M.A.S. guidelines will initiate a deeper understanding of the nature of archival knowledge and how the guidelines attempt to render this knowledge pedagogically manageable.

1. The Guidelines Triumvirate: Contextual, Archival, and Complementary Knowledge

Central to the plan of the M.A.S. guidelines are the three knowledge areas they define: contextual knowledge, archival knowledge, and complementary knowledge. Together, these knowledge areas comprise the discipline of "archival studies." Archival studies is described as involving "all studies which increase knowledge of archives and their treatment from any perspective which is useful to the archivist.... They also include elements of administrative, legal, historical, management, philological, and information studies."²² These latter areas of study are expressed in the contextual and complementary knowledge areas of the curriculum. All three knowledge areas of archival studies must be represented and properly proportioned in graduate archival education programs.

In fact the M.A.S. guidelines recommend that two-thirds of the student's M.A.S. work be concentrated in the archival knowledge area because this category represents the core of an archival studies program. They further recommend that the contextual and complementary knowledge areas represent one-third of the student's work in the curriculum. The complementary disciplines and their knowledge areas will therefore assume their logical role in enhancing archival studies, not overshadowing it as is the case with present graduate archival education programs.

Contextual Knowledge. Contextual knowledge refers to an understanding of the administrative, legal, economic, social, and cultural structures in the United States. The guidelines, as published in May, 1993, classify these areas as education in U.S. organizational history, the U.S. legal system, and U.S. financial systems. At the 1993 SAA annual meeting during September, 1993, the CEPD updated the language of the contextual knowledge area specifically to identify other social frameworks such as professional, cultural, family, and religious systems. Studying these diverse social structures is a critical endeavor for archivists. They must have a deep understanding of the systems in society that create documentation from the conduct of their activities. Archivists will develop the knowledge foundation necessary to understand the context of records creation. That context will inform the theories and methods (represented in the archival knowledge area) that archivists must master to treat archives. This view of social systems linked to records creation is the archival perspective on the study of history and society.

In all likelihood many of the contextual topics will be covered in courses found in the undergraduate program. However, it is also more than likely that the archival perspective will be absent at this level of education. Therefore, it is important that within an M.A.S. program courses are developed to explore the genesis of documentary evidence from the previously studied social systems. Such courses would go beyond the existing introductory "archives and society" courses that typically illustrate the role of archival repositories in a democratic society: preserving the rights of Americans as citizens and providing information to them. Course work within or concurrent with the M.A.S. program must include archival considerations in the study of the social systems that are the most relevant to each student's career objectives. An historical and sociological understanding sufficient to facilitate career-long study of the creation of archives from these processes and frameworks must be instilled in each student.

Archival Knowledge. The archival knowledge area is described as knowledge that "prepares students to treat archives in accordance with their nature." Archival knowledge is born from the nature of archives, the circumstances of their creation. In other words, the knowledge archivists have of the nature of records creation, and their contextual understanding of social systems, is brought to bear on how archivists should manage the archival materials. It is from this awareness that principles such as provenance and original order are conceived. Simply put, archival knowledge is unique to the archival profession. It is not knowledge borrowed from other disciplines. Three instructional components comprise the archival knowledge area: "The History of Archives, Archival Organization and Legislation, and the Character of the Archival Profession"; "Records Management"; and "Archival Science." The instruction will analyze the nature of these components. The records management and

archival science components deserve further explanation due to the rapidly changing social and technological landscapes in which archivists function.

Archival Knowledge: Records Management. A recognition of the increasing involvement of the archivist at the point of records creation is apparent throughout the guidelines. In the "Conceptual Foundations" section the definition of an archival document states that "the nature of archival documents depends on the circumstances of their creation (i.e. why they are made or received). Therefore, archival documents must be protected since the moment of their creation on the grounds that their nature is not related to their degree of currency or type of use."²³ Because of this integral relationship between archives and the process of general records creation, instruction relating to records management is located within the archival knowledge area, not the contextual or the complementary knowledge areas. Including records management as a component of archival knowledge recognizes the importance of the life continuum concept of records, including archival involvement in the records creation phase, particularly where new information technologies are involved.²⁴

The M.A.S. guidelines recognize that records management theory is archival theory. In other words, records management practices are born from the same body of knowledge as archival practices. Archival theory encompasses a "systematic understanding of what documents were made, received, and kept; how and why this was done; and how and why these activities changed or did not change over time."²⁵ This knowledge determines how records are treated at each stage of their life, whether as active records in the office, semi-active records housed in a records center, or records preserved in an archives. Records management practices involving records creation control, record keeping systems, and automated information systems management and analysis all impinge upon the creation, maintenance, and communication of archival records. In practice, archivists must know about the methods and practices of records managers. The inclusion of records management education will also prepare archivists for the myriad records-related positions that enter into both areas in modern organizations.

This understanding of archives and records management fosters a pedagogical approach that creates the potential for M.A.S. programs to become a place where records managers of the future may also receive their professional education. They, too, can learn more about the entire life continuum of records, informing their own work in the records creation and active records phases. Records managers will also become knowledgeable about archival methods and of the requirements archivists have in caring for archives. Records management education in Master of Archival Studies programs will foster beneficial interactions between records managers and archivists and a common knowledge base for all information professionals involved in the management of records.

Archival Knowledge: Archival Science. Archival science is the core of archival knowledge. It represents the knowledge area that is unique to archives, and is thus the focus of the most course work. It is divided into pure theory, or ideas about the nature of archives, and the application of that theory through methodology (the ideas archivists hold about the treatment of archives) and practice (applying these methods in the real world). The M.A.S. guidelines use the phrase "archival science" because it is commonly used in the international archival profession. The word "science" is used as defined in Webster's dictio-

nary: "knowledge possessed or attained through study or practice," or "something that may be studied or learned."²⁶ Archival knowledge expressed in the classroom will focus on the traditional functions of appraisal, acquisition/collection development, preservation, arrangement and description, reference service and the provision of access, and outreach.²⁷ Education in archival science must immerse the student in all aspects of theory, methodology, practice, and review of the scholarship concerning the traditional functions.

The archival science component embodies the core challenges facing the future of the archival profession. Issues such as those involving the effects of automated techniques on performing archival functions and involving records created by new information technologies will challenge archivists' understanding of the nature of archives and subsequently the theories, principles, and methods that have been derived. New methods to select and appraise records for permanent preservation, such as the documentation strategy approach, the information systems concept of appraisal, and such new approaches to appraisal as those offered by Frank Boles and Julia Marks Young, are all examples of developing archival methodologies that can be studied, analyzed, and synthesized into new and more useful perspectives to be taught to the next generation of archivists. The archival science component of the M.A.S. guidelines represents the intellectual core of the degree. Through its application in future M.A.S. programs all aspects of the nature of archives, throughout their life cycle, can be researched, observed, questioned, and better understood. The resulting new methods offered to carry out archival functions can be taught to current and future U.S. archivists in an effort to improve the quality of documentation selected and managed in archives.

Complementary Knowledge and the Interdisciplinary Perspective. Education in the complementary knowledge areas "gives students the instruments of other disciplines that can be brought to bear on their own, thereby contributing to its [archival studies] enrichment and development."²⁸ Inclusion of the complementary knowledge area in an M.A.S. program recognizes the interdisciplinary nature of archival studies. In fact, it is not just recognized but inherent in the guidelines. These two areas of knowledge, core archival knowledge and knowledge from other disciplines, must be integrated to better inform the work of archivists. This coupling will result in the new methods and technologies archivists need to utilize when managing modern archival records. The cross-fertilization present in archival studies will give rise to new practices in archival management, and perhaps even new theories of archival science. This is where the discipline of archival studies is forged.

A likely place for the interdisciplinary nature of archival education to flourish is in the study of records from new information technologies. The necessity of the archival management of electronic records requires such an approach. Where once the forms of records and the environment in which they were created were stable and familiar, they are now under constant change. The modern era of rapidly and continuously evolving information technologies used to create, maintain, and communicate recorded information has introduced this change. Therefore, methods not heretofore familiar to archivists must be learned, adapted, and applied. Archivists' understanding of records creation, identification and selection for acquisition, appraisal, arrangement, description, preservation, and use will become informed by information science's perspec-

tives on information resource management and the understanding of such topics as information storage and retrieval, and systems design and analysis. The interdisciplinary nature of archival studies, incorporating from other disciplines that which is useful to the archivist, must thrive if archivists are to ensure the future existence of accurate and authentic documentary evidence.

The guidelines are designed to support countless possibilities in the actual construction of the curriculum. M.A.S. programs will naturally utilize the strengths of their parent organizations. Programs located in library and information science schools may wish to develop specializations in the application of information science methods. A school with an emphasis in preservation administration and conservation may develop an archival specialty in that area. Some history department-based M.A.S. programs may establish a special focus on acquisition and appraisal, applying their strengths in utilizing various research methodologies and the study of administrative history. Schools of administration could specialize in educating future archival administrators in both the public and private arenas, as well as developing a public records specialty. The degree program could be jointly administered, as is currently the case with the graduate archival curricula at the University of Maryland's School of Library and Information Science and History Department. M.A.S. degrees in several locations will foster appropriate educational standards, consensus regarding requisite subject matter, subject specializations, and many creative approaches to archival pedagogy.

One factor carrying significant implications for determining the location of M.A.S. programs is the availability of, and experience in using, information technologies for instructional purposes. Several library and information science schools have invested in these technologies, possessing the requisite experience to employ them in the curriculum. On the other hand, most history departments have not used these technologies in their courses. They may not be knowledgeable about the university's technological resources and how to apply them in a curricular program like archival studies that is grounded in information management. If the information technologies are not readily available, then the M.A.S. program may have to look elsewhere for critical instructional support involving these resources.

2. The Practicum

While many components of the M.A.S. guidelines represent a departure from past perspectives on U.S. graduate archival education, one component did not evolve along the same path. This component is the practicum. Ironically, when the SAA CEPD convened in 1990 it was to review the need for guidelines to practicums. Instead, the committee identified the need for M.A.S. guidelines and began a three-year march to produce the draft published in the May, 1993 issue of *Archival Outlook*. After three years, the practicum portion of the M.A.S. guidelines still does not spell out its composition. However, the lack of prescription here is consistent with the remainder of the guidelines.

The CEPD consciously chose not to develop courses or a curriculum, entrusting that assignment to the universities and their archival educators. In much the same way, the CEPD choose not to prescribe to archival educators the definition of a practicum experience. The CEPD recognized that practicums provide the critical link educational programs must have with members of the archival pro-

fession. Such a link can provide a vital avenue for practitioners to inform the work of educators, for educators to inform the work of practitioners, and for students to benefit from both groups. However, the archival profession needs research into the utility and success of practical experiences within educational programs. Without a more mature understanding of the role and benefits of the practicum, the CEPD decided to describe basic objectives²⁹ for it, allowing archival educators to develop creative curricular improvements. This may be construed as a missed opportunity in the M.A.S. guidelines.

3. Infrastructure: The Development of Faculty-Level Archival Educators

The "Infrastructures" section of the SAA M.A.S. guidelines develops the recommendations for the institutional setting of the program discussed earlier, the program's duration, qualifications for faculty appointments, and standards for student admissions. Qualifications employed while developing the new generation of faculty-level archival educators will play a critical role in the overall development and viability of the M.A.S. The guidelines recommend that the faculty should include at least one full-time tenure-track position to inaugurate an M.A.S. program. It is possible to use supplemental faculty from relevant disciplines in other university departments, and adjunct faculty from outside the university. They should be used to implement instruction in the archival and complementary knowledge areas. This deployment of faculty will likely be implemented early in an M.A.S. program's life. As it matures the program should take on more archival science educators who will instruct virtually all the courses in the core archival knowledge area. Fewer adjunct instructors should then be used for core knowledge areas. Supplemental faculty will also be utilized increasingly for complementary knowledge area courses only. Of course, the benefits of team-teaching with supplemental and adjunct faculty should not be dismissed.

Caution must be employed with respect to faculty size. The use of supplemental or adjunct instructors should not be substituted for the long-term growth of the M.A.S. faculty and the subsequent growth of the curriculum in the core archival knowledge areas. In fact, this danger is occurring in U.S. graduate archival education today. Universities should avoid the inherent danger of offering too few core archival courses and too many "plausible electives" and "related" courses, the pitfalls of which Tim Ericson notes. The potential hazards of employing one archival educator complemented by four or five supplemental and adjunct instructors should be evident.

Qualifications for the tenure-track archival educator include formal academic education in archives, a record of scholarship and professional involvement, and relevant archival work experience. In all likelihood archival educators will need to hold a doctorate degree, but this would be the requirement of the particular university; the degree in question is not prescribed in the guidelines. Potential exists for future archival educators to be selected from among graduates of doctoral programs in library and information science schools that offer a sequence of archival courses. In the course of completing the doctoral requirements graduates conduct extended research into archival issues. In 1993 approximately ten doctoral students were enrolled in six different universities who fit this description.³⁰ If universities will look for faculty-level archival educators with credentials similar to other faculty—a doctoral degree concentrating on the appropriate

field of study, dissertation and scholarly publications, professional activity, and experience—then these doctoral students may become likely candidates for archival educator positions.

Additional Concerns about the Establishment of M.A.S. Programs

A few common concerns about the implications of establishing M.A.S. programs have not yet been addressed directly. One concern is that the establishment of a small group of M.A.S. programs has the potential to cause two- and three-course sequence programs to fall by the wayside. But if we observe the Canadian experience, at least five universities grant graduate and undergraduate certificates in archives and records management, such as the Université de Montreal and Université Laval programs mentioned earlier. Also, at least six universities offer one-, two-, or three-course sequences within their M.L.S. or history degree programs.³¹ Community colleges also provide information management training courses for paraprofessionals, which include instruction in archival practice. George Brown College offers a Certificate of Archival Practices and Algonquin College in Ottawa offers a two-year archives technician training program. In Quebec eight junior and technical colleges offer courses in archival administration.

In the United States M.A.S. programs may have a similar effect. One might conclude from the Canadian experience that Master of Archival Studies degree programs have not rendered small educational programs irrelevant. Instead they have fostered a new class of archival education that addresses the technical skills and understanding necessary for paraprofessional employment in archives. Perhaps future course work available at the undergraduate level in the United States will address the need for paraprofessional education and training. Not all prospective archives students will want to leave their hometown to travel to an M.A.S. program site. Many students, for a wealth of reasons, will continue to seek the best available education through their local library schools and history departments and will seek employment nearby.

Another frequently voiced concern is that universities will not buy into the M.A.S. degree program for financial reasons. While the universities' financial problems are real, this point of view ignores the facts regarding the recent advancements made by graduate archival education in the U.S. and the overwhelming success of the M.A.S. in Canada. Schools of library and information science at the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Texas at Austin, Long Island University, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee are working toward offering a requisite number of courses, and maintaining their existing faculty-level archival educator positions, so that they can establish the M.A.S. degree.³² The administrations of these schools have all made long-term commitments to developing graduate archival education and are supportive of SAA's work toward composing these guidelines. Chances are that over the next several years these schools will have a very extensive M.L.S./archival certificate program or an M.A.S. degree program in place.

Perhaps the greatest threat to the emergence of M.A.S. programs is the confluence of education relating to information disciplines under the rubric of information studies. Schools of library science are evolving into schools of library and information science. In some cases this change is only cosmetic,

maintaining essentially the same library science curricula. However, in other cases, schools of information studies are emerging with completely revamped curricula. There are two models of development. One resembles the University of British Columbia School of Library, Archival, and Information Studies. Each of the disciplines are represented by independent academic programs offering independent degrees. In this example the archival studies program does not require any library science courses. It treats information science topics within archival studies courses as they become relevant. This arrangement closely resembles a college of liberal arts and sciences where the strength is at the department level and many degrees are offered. The concept of an M.A.S. degree fits easily within this expanded concept of information studies, respecting the boundaries of the distinct professions and their need for distinct educational programs.

The second model is being employed at the School of Library and Information Science at the Université de Montreal³³ and the Faculty of Library and Information Studies at the University of Toronto. These two schools are building a model core curriculum based on information science and offering specializations in fields such as library science, archival science, and information resource management. In this configuration the schools offer one degree, in which information science and technology is the major field of study, while fields like library science and archival science are the minor concentrations. These programs appear to exploit the interdisciplinary nature of archival studies. However, their approach is problematic because it does not provide enough curricula to address the distinct and substantial body of archival knowledge. It also addresses only the interrelationship between information science, library science, and archival science. It does not provide the necessary curricular support to explore the contributions that fields such as conservation, history, and management make to archival studies.

The information studies degree approach is all too similar to history departments' approach to professional archival education. These departments, frequently through public history programs, offer courses in many different history-related fields and attach them to traditional graduate history curricula which comprise the major field of study. Public history program directors claim their graduates are fully prepared to enter any one of the fields they treat in their program.³⁴ In the information studies scenario archival science is again relegated to a minor concentration. Archival education has been the stepchild of history and library education, and now may be adopted as the stepchild of computer and information science education. It is time to cast off these time-worn and inadequate approaches to professional archival education.

Information science education is a critical component when teaching archivists how to manage archival electronic records. However, it must fall upon archival science to inform the methods archivists use when executing the functions they have always performed: to preserve and provide access to archival records. Information science education mixed with inadequate archival science education will create information scientists who do not know how to identify, preserve, and provide access to archival electronic records. Archivists, now more than ever before, must be thoroughly knowledgeable in the theories and methods belonging to archival science. Without them archivists will not know how to manage modern archival records. The Master of Archival Studies

degree provides the appropriate interdisciplinary approach without losing sight of the importance of archival science, the body of knowledge which identifies the mission of the archival profession.

Conclusion

The ascendancy of the M.A.S. degree will be an evolutionary process. It will not affect this generation of archivists. It will not affect hiring practices until a critical mass of graduates exists from which to choose for virtually any job search. The M.A.S. effort exists for the next generation of U.S. archivists, those who will inherit our legacies. In the future, when young students decide to study archives and pursue a career in the field, they will not have to choose only from library science or history programs in which the archives discipline is but a minor concentration, a stepchild of the host program. Instead, students will be able to choose from a group of archival studies programs where archives will be the major field of study. The M.A.S. program will become a place where students can learn in an academic setting what previous generations of archivists discovered and codified about their work in the course of performing it.

The future Master of Archival Studies programs will shape the way in which archivists of the next generation receive their professional education. They will become home to sustained research into how we select archives for inclusion in our repositories, how to properly persuade records creators to be mindful of archival considerations, and innumerable aspects of archival work too long to list. M.A.S. programs will bring the rise of archival scholars in the United States. The U.S. will join the ranks of the world's nations who already have deemed it necessary to make such an investment in the archival profession and the unique skills archivists employ when selecting, maintaining, and providing access to records and the information they contain.

Yes, as with most professions, there will always be those who enter through the back door. However, this is not the point. The Master of Archival Studies is not about closing that back door. It is about creating a front door that today does not exist at all. The M.A.S. is about giving the study of archives a home. Its essence will lie in studying the nature of ideas about archives and archivists' work, the methods brought to bear upon it, and the actual practice of archivists. It is a place where archivists can build a strong voice to persuade American society of the importance of the profession's mission.

The Master of Archival Studies will be as inclusive or exclusive as U.S. archivists want it to be, so long as they articulate their desires to those universities who one day will consider establishing M.A.S. programs. Without guidelines universities would be free to create any kind of program they want, and to call it an M.A.S. program. However, archivists should be concerned that a program's curriculum focuses on archival knowledge, explores related disciplines to an appropriate extent, supports new research, and creates new methodologies. Archivists, through SAA, are preparing to provide guidance to universities. The Society of American Archivists' *Guidelines for the Development of a Curriculum for a Master of Archival Studies* is the embodiment of these concerns and desires.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Tyler O. Walters is the University Archivist of Iowa State University. He holds an M.A. in Archival Management from North Carolina State University and is currently the co-chair of the SAA Committee on Education and Professional Development. Walters has written articles and presented numerous papers on the topics of graduate archival education and professional development in the United States. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the May, 1993 Midwest Archives Conference meeting and at the 1993 Society of American Archivists annual meeting.

NOTES

1. Terry Eastwood, "Nurturing Archival Education in the University," *American Archivist* 51 (1988): 238.
2. "Archives Education Guidelines Approved," *SAA Newsletter* (May 1977).
3. "Archives Education Guidelines Approved." Also, Philip P. Mason, "The Society of American Archivists in the Seventies: Report of the Committee for the 1970's," *American Archivist* 35 (1972): 209-210.
4. The notion that archival science is a discipline distinct from history or library science had not yet come to fruition in the United States.
5. "Society of American Archivists Guidelines for Graduate Archival Education Programs," *American Archivist* 51 (1988): 382-88.
6. Terry Eastwood, "Nurturing Archival Education in the University," 238.
7. "SAA Guidelines for Graduate Archival Education Programs, 1988": "This strengthening has been exemplified by the post-1977 emergence of multi-course graduate archival education programs that grant certificates or master's with concentrations in archival administration. The guidelines that follow are designed to support this development."
8. Frederick Stielow, "The Impact of Information Technology on Archival Theory: A Discourse on an Automation Pedagogy," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 34 (1993): 64, n. 21. Issue entitled, "Educating the Archivist for the Twenty-First Century."
9. In addition to the 1988 guidelines, the SAA Role Delineation document of 1989 presented a comprehensive description of knowledge areas that would be tested through the certification exam for archivists. See "Society of American Archivists Role Delineation Document," *SAA Newsletter* (January 1989): 6-8.
10. "Society of American Archivists Guidelines for Graduate Archival Education Programs," *American Archivist* 51 (1988): 382-388.
11. In addition to the *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* issue, examples of other recent articles pointing to the need for M.A.S. degree programs in the United States are: Frank Boles, "Archival Education: Basic Characteristics and Core Curriculum," *AHA Perspectives* 28 (October 1990): 1-11; Paul Conway, "Archival Education and the Need for Full-Time Faculty," *American Archivist* 51 (1988): 254-265; James O'Toole, "Curriculum Development in Archival Education: A Proposal," *American Archivist* 53 (1990): 460-466; and Susan E. Davis, "Archival Education: The Next Step," *Midwestern Archivist* 14 (1989): 13-21.
12. Timothy L. Ericson, "Abolish the Recent: The Progress of Archival Education," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 34 (1993): 27.
13. The core archival knowledge areas are generally described as appraisal, acquisition/collection development, preservation, arrangement and description, reference service and the provision of access, and outreach. See Society of American Archivists, "Guidelines for the Development of a Curriculum for a Master of Archival Studies," draft, in *Archival Outlook* (May 1993): 6. (Hereafter cited as "SAA M.A.S. Draft Guidelines").
14. James O'Toole, in his previously cited article, "Curriculum Development in Archival Education: A Proposal," develops a similar classification of courses, a "cluster" approach that categorizes the functions and concepts found in the archival profession.
15. Timothy L. Ericson, "Abolish the Recent: The Progress of Archival Education," p. 26. The three course types: introduction to archival theory, independent study, and a practicum are defined as the minimally acceptable three-course sequence found in the SAA's 1988 guidelines.

16. Frederick Stielow, "The Impact of Information Technology on Archival Theory: A Discourse on an Automation Pedagogy," p. 55. Stielow refers to the existence of a "dozen or so full-time archival educators."
17. Greg Hunter, archival educator of the Palmer School of Library and Information Science at Long Island University, stated on the Archives & Archivists Listserv on October 8, 1993 some of the benefits of having full-time archival educators. The main benefit is the "ability to influence curriculum" by being involved in routine faculty business. Hunter claims that "without a full-time presence on the faculty, it is almost impossible to introduce new courses." Another benefit is the "ability to influence the hiring decisions of other full-time faculty." Hunter says of Long Island University that "we've been able to build a faculty of individuals supportive of archives and able to see the connections with their own disciplines." Randall Jimerson on the Archives & Archivists Listserv, October 8, 1993, also described the frustrations of being an adjunct professor teaching the archival education component. Jimerson recounts that while he was involved in issues regarding the archival education program, he was "almost never consulted about department-wide curriculum development, hiring, or departmental policy." He further stated that "whenever I tried to improve the archival program, I was accused of trying to dilute the History component." These experiences relate the need for full-time archival faculty and other faculty sympathetic to the need for graduate archival education.
18. Marcel Caya, ed., *Canadian Archives in 1992* (Ottawa: Canadian Council of Archives, 1992), 107.
19. Terry Eastwood, "Revision of the Curriculum of the Master of Archival Studies Program," *ACA Bulletin* 13 (1989): 17-20.
20. Marcel Caya, ed., *Canadian Archives in 1992*, 110.
21. See "SAA M.A.S. Draft Guidelines," pp. 2-3, for the exact language of the goals of the M.A.S. and the objectives of SAA in creating M.A.S. guidelines.
22. "SAA M.A.S. Draft Guidelines," p. 4. For further explanation of the terms archival science (which is comprised of theory, methodology, and practice) and archival discipline see Luciana Duranti, "The Archival Body of Knowledge: Archival Theory, Method, and Practice, and Graduate and Continuing Education," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 34 (1993): 10-11.
23. "SAA M.A.S. Draft Guidelines," p. 3.
24. See Jay Atherton, "From Life Cycle to Continuum: Some Thoughts of the Records Management-Archives Relationship," *Archivaria* 21 (Winter 1985-1986): 43-51.
25. Luciana Duranti, "The Archival Body of Knowledge: Archival Theory, Method, and Practice and Graduate and Continuing Education," p. 10.
26. *Webster's New International Dictionary*, 3d ed., s.v. "science."
27. "SAA M.A.S. Draft Guidelines," p. 2.
28. "SAA M.A.S. Draft Guidelines," p. 4. The guidelines incorporate the perspectives of the major complementary fields of study: conservation, library and information science, management, and history, and incorporating knowledge of a diverse group of research methods.
29. The major objective articulated in the guidelines is that a practicum "is not an exercise to discover theory and methods empirically, but an opportunity for the students to verify their understanding of archival principles by applying them in real life situations, to test in the professional arena the theoretical and methodological knowledge acquired in the classroom." "SAA M.A.S. Draft Guidelines," p. 7.
30. Information from Anne Gilliland-Swetland, Ph.D. candidate, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Michigan, in conversations with the author, May 1993.
31. These programs are at the universities of Alberta, Western Ontario, Windsor, McGill, Dalhousie, and Simon Fraser University.
32. To date, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee does not have a full-time faculty archival educator position. However, the Library and Information Science school is moving forward with examining a curriculum proposal to establish an M.A.S. degree program.
33. Suzanne Bertrand-Gastaldy, Paulette Bernhard, and Jean-Marc Cyr, "Reconstructing a Master's Degree Program in Library and Information Studies: The Université de Montreal Experience," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 34 (1993): 228-243.
34. Tyler O. Walters, "Possible Educations for Archivists: Integrating Graduate Archival Education with Public History Education Programs," *American Archivist* 54 (1991): 484-492.